

REMARKS

Claims 2, 4, and 9, amended claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 10-15, and new claims 16 and 17 are in this application.

Claims 1-3 and 5-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,805,763 (Lawler et al.).

Amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"accepting means for accepting a selection of the program attribute information by a user based on the presented program attribute names and an escape keyword that is excluded from a title of the program or detailed information introducing contents of the program;" (Emphasis added.)

In explaining the above 103 rejection, and as best understood, the Examiner appears to rely on lines 23-31 of column 11 and element 130 of Fig. 6 of Lawler to disclose the accepting means of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Lawler do not appear to disclose the above-identified feature of claim 1. That is, such portion of Lawler does not appear to disclose "accepting means for accepting a selection . . . based on . . . and an escape keyword that is excluded from a title of the program or detailed information introducing contents of the program." (Emphasis added.) Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is distinguishable from Lawler as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 5-8 and 11-15 are also distinguishable from Lawler as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 2, 3, 9, and 10 and new dependent claims 16 and 17 are dependent from one of the amended independent claims. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16 and 17 are distinguishable from Lawler as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawler et al. (as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,636,688 (Otana).

Claim 4 is dependent from amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claim 4 is distinguishable from Lawler as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Otana to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Lawler. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 4 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Lawler and Otana.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.  
Registration No.: 34,930  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicants

884125\_1.DOC